

**REMARKS**

Claims 18 to 43 are now pending in the above-identified application. Claims 18, 19, 20, 22, and 23 have been amended. Claims 36 and 37 were canceled. Claim 38 to 43 have been added. Additions are shown by underlining, deletions are shown by strikeout. No new matter has been added.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of this response.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 29 to 34 and 36 to 37 are allowable.

Applicants also thank the Examiner for indicating that claim 19 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including any limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claim 19 has been rewritten above as suggested by the Examiner. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 19 is now in condition for allowance; and, withdrawal of the objection to claim 19 is respectfully requested.

Claims 20 and 22 were objected to for informalities. Claim 20 recited improper antecedent basis for “the first predefinable natural number.” Claim 20 has been amended to properly depend from claim 19 which recites “a first predefinable natural number.” Support for this amendment can be found in the originally filed claims and Specification. No new matter has been added. Claim 22 was objected to for reciting “N.” Claim 22 has been amended to properly depend from claim 19. Support for this amendment can be found in the originally filed claims and Specification. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 20 and 22 should now be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 19, since each now depends from claim 19.

Claim 23 has been amended to properly depend from claim 19. Support for this amendment can be found in the originally filed claims and Specification. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claim 23 should now be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 19, since claim 23 now depends from claim 19.

Claims 38 to 43 were added as new claims to and depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 19. Accordingly, those claims should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 19, since claims 38 to 43 depend from claim 19.

In light of the amendments to claims 19 and 20, claims 36 and 37 were rendered duplicates and thus, claims 36 and 37 were canceled.

Claims 18 and 20 to 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,233,656 to Langrand et al. (“Langrand reference”). Claims 20, 22 and 23 were amended to recite from claim 19. Accordingly, the rejection of those claims is now moot in light of the amendments above.

The Langrand reference purportedly concerns telephone installation for the remote loading of telephone rental data of an independent station. Title. The Langrand reference refers to a control means, in response to a request for a call and in the presence of a load signal, searches all the telephone rental data relative to the independent station and that indicating an order for the remote loading. Abstract, lines 1-5. The Langrand reference further refers to a coding means codes with the help of a special key data which is secret, and a processing means which authorizes the transmission of non-secret public telephone rental data as well as secret data thus encoded to the independent station according to the order for the remote loading. Abstract, lines 5-11. The independent station uses a decoding means to decipher the coded secret telephone rental data received with the help of the special key and a processing means which stored the non-secret public data transmitted and secret data decoded. Abstract, lines 12-17.

Amended claim 18 recites:

A method for generating a personal identification number (PIN) having a number of N decimal digits, to be used for money cards and other security-requiring devices, comprising:

generating the personal identification number from a binary number having L digits so that the personal identification number is randomly distributed over an available number domain,

wherein the binary number having L digits is generated at least in-part from data pertaining to an individual.

The Langrand reference at col. 11, lines 20 et seq. indicates that a coding/decoding means CDF of the authorization centre calculates a respective transformation S1 and S2 of a first and second random numbers EPIN1 and EPIN2 by a cryptographic function F with the help of a secret key EPID. Id. The Langrand reference further states that the control means generates the PIN, which is representative of a secret telephone rental data, with the help of the sum of the transformation S1 and of the product of transformation S2 by  $2^{32}$ , which allows

a PIN out of 64 bits to be obtained. Id. According to the Langrand reference, the control means can generate the PIN with the additional help of a complimentary variable data EPIN3, worth 64 bits, generated by the control means and completing the calculation according to an EXCLUSIVE or sum. Id. Thus, the Langrand reference does not identically disclose (as it must for anticipation) a method for generating the personal identification number having N digits from a binary number having L digits so that the personal identification number is randomly distributed over an available number domain and wherein the binary number having L digits is generated at least in-part from data pertaining to an individual, as in amended claim 18. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over the Langrand reference is respectfully requested.

Since claims 21 and 24 to 28 depend from claim 18, those claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 18.

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that all of claims 18 to 43 (except canceled claims 36 and 37) of the present application are allowable for the foregoing reasons.

#### CONCLUSION

In view of all of the above, it is believed that the rejections of claims 18 and 20 to 28 and the objections to claims 20 and 22 have been obviated. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that all claims 18 to 35 and 38 to 43 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections and objections be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that the present application issue as early as possible.

If it would further allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at any time.

Respectfully submitted,

By: *Quinda Shuler*  
Reg. No. 47084

Dated: April 19, 2004

By: *Richard L. Mayer*  
Richard L. Mayer  
(Reg. No. 22,490)

**CUSTOMER NO. 26646**

KENYON & KENYON  
One Broadway  
New York, New York 10004  
(212) 425-7200